



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/040,046	10/19/2001	John B. Taylor	396542	1834
Kenneth D Goetz Lathrop & Gage LC Suite 2800 2345 Grand Boulevard Kansas City, MO 64108				
7590 09/23/2009				
EXAMINER				
LEVY, NEIL S				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
1615				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
09/23/2009		PAPER		

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

### Office Action Summary

**Application No.**

10/040,046

**Applicant(s)**

TAYLOR, JOHN B.

**Examiner**

NEIL LEVY

**Art Unit**

1615

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 11 September 2009.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-14 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-14 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SE/US)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

### **DETAILED ACTION**

The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

There still is no oath for the last amendment.

In accordance with 37 CFR 1.175(b)(1), a supplemental reissue oath/declaration under 37 CFR 1.175(b)(1) must be received before this reissue application can be allowed.

See MPEP § 1414.01.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

Claims 1,2,6 & 12 STAND rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Spraker- 4350770.

Applicant's arguments filed 6/29/09 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant argues pH of SPRAKER is basic, and the wastewater is far below the instant concentrations.

Example I meets the instant claim 1 requirement. SPRAKER shows pH as low as 5.5- that meets the instant claim 5 to 7 ,and the functional advantage as a foliar spray is not claimed. One in the art would find it obvious to test to determine effective amounts.

Claims 1, 6 & 12 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fenn et al '84 & Dolan et al '88, with evidence exemplified by Barlet-5070083.

Applicant's arguments filed 6/29/09 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive Applicant argues BARLET teaches away from FEEN and DOLAN. Examiner finds BARLET shows high levels are usable, thus testing of the FEEN/DOLAN composition concentrations would be reasonable and one would expect success.

Claims 1, 6 & 12 STAND rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Barlet 5070083, Ducret et al 4139616, Horriere et al 5169646, Lovatt 5514200, Vetanovetz et al 53905418 and Smilie et al '89.

Here, too, we find one in the art would be aware of these references & straight forward testing would enable one to achieve desired effects, in accord with standard practice in the horticultural arts. These references, of record, teach the instant Phosphonate salts are well known, art recognized fungicides (Bartlet, Ducret & Horriere) while Lovatt & Vetanovetz likewise teach the Phosphates are well known, art recognized fertilizers. Smillie shows the effectiveness of phosphite salts are enhanced with phosphates (p 924 of Smillie).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made desiring to utilize fungicidal control means on plants, to use any of art recognized means, modified as desired to increase stability, dispersibility, compatibility of ingredients, processing ease, decreased toxicity to handlers, increased

toxicity to fungus, & to provide added benefit;fertilizer & fungicide in one application.

The particular manner in which the compositions are made is not seen to be of patentable weight. Simple testing would enable one in the art to determine the optimal amounts needed , & is in the purview of the artisan to perform. See KSR V TELEFLEX @ 82 USPQ 2d @ 1385.

The amounts and proportions of each ingredient are result effective parameters chosen to obtain the desired effects. It would have been obvious to vary the form of each ingredient to optimize the effect desired, depending upon the particular species and application method of interest, reduction of toxicity, cost minimization, enhanced, and prolonged, or synergistic effects.

Applicant has not provided any objective evidence of criticality, nonobvious or unexpected results that the combination of the particular ingredients' or concentrations provides any greater or different level of prior art expectation as claimed, and the use of ingredient for the functionality for which they are known to be used is not basis for patentability.

The instant invention provides well known old art recognized compounds, with well known art recognized effects, applied by well known art recognized methods to achieve improved control as is well known in the art.

Applicant's arguments filed 6/29/09 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.Applicant objects to the form and incompleteness and believes it is not shown that one can combine phosphonates and phosphates at will.

The rejection was written that the rejection STANDS, as of the prior rejection in the prior office action, & so was not repeated word for word..

Examiner is examining compositions-the combination objected to is seen as reasonable to provide at will. The methods of the cited art, as presented on 12/03/07, show that SMILIE et al 1989 provides advantages of the combination of the art known phosphonates and phosphates. SMILIE was submitted by applicant in SN # 09/954926 as "-The Mode of Action -", and in SN# 09/ 419127.

#### ***Double Patenting***

Claims 1,3-14 STAND rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-12 of U.S. Patent No. US006509041B2 . Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the patent claims encompasses the instant claims & would anticipate them.

Claims 1, 3-5,9-11 STAND rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim2,4,5 of U.S. Patent No. 5800837. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the patent claims encompass the instant compositions, ratios, & concentrations, thus besides stimulating growth, the patent would inherently meet the instant claim to control fungus.

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

**THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to NEIL LEVY whose telephone number is 571-272-0619. The examiner can normally be reached on Tuesday-Friday, 7 AM to 5:30 PM EST..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, MICHAEL WOODWARD can be reached on 571-272-8373. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/NEIL LEVY/  
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1615